

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed May 3, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Itkis (U.S. Patent No. 4,856,787). Claims 1, 7, and 15 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Office Action states that:

“Itkis discloses memory to store machine readable game codes and a processor to execute said codes to offer games and bonuses related to the games to [a] plurality of slave game device[s] from a master game device.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the reason, among others, discussed below.

Applicant's independent claim 1 provides for “a memory configured to store machine readable game code; and a processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal.” Thus, a single processor or control module may be used to present two or more games on two or more different game terminals. This is further supported in the Specification whereby the “control module 60 comprises a CPU 66 that is, configured to control the game offered on the first game terminal 62 and the second game terminal 64. The CPU 66 communicates with a memory 68. In this embodiment the memory 68 is configured to store machine readable code that is written to present a game to the first game terminal 62 and the second game terminal 64.” (Specification, [0036]). This “results in a cost saving on a per game terminal basis or on a per game basis because certain devices, such as the processor and memory can be shared and configured to control multiple games” (Specification, [0007]).

Itkis teaches “a distributed game network comprising a master game device and a number of slave game devices.” (Col. 1, lines 41-43). The slave device allows for concurrent playing of multiple different games with just one player’s terminal and “is an intelligent (smart) game terminal comprising the microprocessor.” (Col. 2, lines 57-59). The master gaming device is merely a “general purpose computer” that does not run game code, but merely provides data such as the bingo pattern and/or the called bingo or keno numbers. (Col. 3, lines 14, 55-62).

Itkis is silent as to where and if the master gaming device or the slave gaming device stores the machine readable gamed code, but does teach that the slave game device, due “to the nature of the poker game, the task 17 runs independently of the operations of the master game device.” (Col. 3, lines 49-51). Furthermore, the “slave game device provides two modes of playing the bingo game, namely the automatic mode 39 and the manual mode 40.” (Col. 4, lines 47-490. This appears to indicate that the slave device, as the intelligent game terminal comprising the microprocessor, runs the game code since the games may be run independently of the master gaming device.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Itkis does not teach or discuss having a memory to store machine readable game code nor does Itkis teach or mention machine readable game code. Rather, Itkis merely teaches that the slave device comprises a microprocessor and is silent as to where the microprocessor obtains the game code and whether the slave device is using game code to run the games.

Thus, Itkis does not teach each and every element as set forth in the claimed invention. Itkis does not teach “a memory configured to store machine readable game code; and a processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal” as claimed in Claim 1. Claims 7 and 15 provide for similar features. Rather, Itkis merely teaches a slave device that may run game code to allow for the concurrent playing of multiple different games on one terminal.

As to dependent claims 2-6, 8-14 and 16-20, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Itkis in view of Stepan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,621,814). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 7. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claim being allowable, the dependent claim must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No.IGT1P277).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/
Adrienne Yeung
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001